UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,723	08/11/2006	Dirk Muehlhoff	3081.153US01	6153
	7590 08/21/2009 I, THUENTE, SKAAR & CHRISTENSEN, P.A.		EXAMINER	
4800 IDS CENTER			HUNTER, RONALD A	
80 SOUTH 8TH STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-2100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3769	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Commence	10/565,723	MUEHLHOFF ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	RONALD HUNTER	3769					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim 11 apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from 12 cause the application to become ABANDONEI	Lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/24/2	2006						
	action is non-final.						
	/						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
	Claim(s) <u>12-29</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
·	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>12-29</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 January 2006</u> is/are: a)□ accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/24/2006 & 9/23/2008.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite					

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because the reference characters "g", "ga" and "gp" are not found in the specification. For purposes of examination, examiner has interpreted these characters as "9", "9a", and "9p". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 3769

Claim Objections

Claims 12, 15, 16, & 24 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 12, 15, 16, & 24 – recite a "transparent material" and a "material." It is unclear if these references are analogous. Consistency with terminology is suggested.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In claims 18 & 24, line 2 - applicant positively recites part of a human, i.e. "a transparent material (cornea)". Thus claims 18-29 include a human within their scope and are non-statutory.

A claim directed to or including within its scope a human is not considered to be patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. The grant of a limited, but exclusive property right in a human being is prohibited by the Constitution. In re Wakefield, 422 F.2d 897, 164 USPQ 636 (CCPA 1970).

Application/Control Number: 10/565,723 Page 4

Art Unit: 3769

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 15 recites the limitation "the desired location" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "the desired location" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 22 recites the limitation "the spiral" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Juhasz et al. (US 5,993,438 A).

Regarding claims 12, 15, Juhasz et al. disclose a method for performing photodisruption (forming a cut) and removal of tissue in a stroma (transparent material o) of a cornea of an eye using a pulsed laser beam, which is sequentially focused to individual spots at a plurality of points in the stroma (column 1, lines 63-67). Examiner has interpreted a pattern of spots in each layer positioned in a spiral pattern as, adjusting the focal point three-dimensionally along a main axis and elevation lines parallel to the optical axis, and which is substantially centro-symmetric (substantially at a right angle) to the optical axis of the eye. The result is a plurality of substantially flat layers of photodisrupted stromal tissue, each layer being substantially perpendicular and substantially symmetric to the optical axis (Fig. 2; column 3, lines 29-34).

Regarding claims 13, 16, Juhasz et al. disclose a method for performing photodisruption (forming a cut) and removal of tissue in a stroma of the cornea in the eye (column 1, lines 63-67), wherein the examiner has interpreted the stroma is posteriorly located in respect to the epithelium of the cornea along the optical axis.

Regarding claims 14, 17, Juhasz et al. disclose the pattern of spots in each layer can be positioned in a spiral pattern which is substantially centro-symmetric to the optical axis of the eye. The result is a plurality of substantially flat layers of photodisrupted stromal tissue, each layer being substantially perpendicular and

Application/Control Number: 10/565,723

Art Unit: 3769

substantially symmetric to the optical axis. Examiner has interpreted creating substantially flat layers in a spiral pattern as generating optical breakthroughs on anterior parts without obscuring the transparent material on posterior parts.

Claims 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Swinger et al. (6,325,792 B1).

Regarding claims 18, 20, & 24, Swinger et al. disclose an apparatus for corneal surgery (column 1, lines 15-17). A lasing medium of the pulsed laser apparatus uses lasing ions such as titanium, chromium or neodymium (for example, Ti₃:Al₂O₃, Cr:LiSrAlF₆, Nd:YLF, or similar lasers) (column 36, lines 53-56), the laser unit 100 includes a seed laser 102 and a scanner-amplifier laser 104 (column 17, lines 16-17), and the beam intensity controller 112 is coupled to a computer control unit 114, which is suitably programmed to vary the intensity of the output surgical laser beam S as required for a particular surgical procedure (Fig. 6; column 17, lines 50-53) and spot 58 is then moved in a scanning motion under computer control along a spiral (sinusoidal function) (Fig. 7, #619; column 25, lines 12 & 13), wherein examiner has interpreted the spiral as extending along, a main axis that is at substantially right angles to, and elevation lines that are substantially parallel to, an optical axis.

Regarding claims 19 & 25, Swinger et al. disclose a zoom lens 106 may be placed in a number of suitable positions along the optical path of the laser beam between the laser unit 100 and a target (Fig. 6; column 17, lines 24-26) and deflectable

mirrors (deflecting unit) may then be used to steer the surgical laser beam (column 20, lines 16 & 17).

The recitation "for adjusting the point substantially along the optical axis and for two-dimensional adjustment of the focal point substantially at right angles to the optical axis" is based on intended us. The structure disclosed by Swinger et al. would inherently perform as claimed when used in the same manner.

Regarding claims 21, 26 & 27, Swinger et al. disclose a spiral scanning motion under computer control coupled with a zoom lens and adjustable optics (see figure 6, Fig. 7, #619; column 25, lines 12 & 13), wherein examiner has interpreted the spiral as a deflection in one of two spatial directions according to a second substantially sinusoidal function, and in the other of the two spatial direction according to a substantially linear function having an oscillation or stepped function superimposed thereon.

Regarding claims 22, 23, 28 & 29, Swinger et al. disclose ablation proceeds from posterior to anterior within the cornea to avoid absorption of the beam energy by plasma. Thus, the beam spot is always moving into unablated tissue (not obscured by previously created optical breakthroughs) (column 30, lines 60-63).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following references are cited for disclosing related

Application/Control Number: 10/565,723 Page 8

Art Unit: 3769

Imitations of the applicant's claimed and disclosed invention: Bille et al. (US 4,901,718 A) teaches 3-dimensional laser beam guidance, Juhasz et al. (US 2003/0014042 A1) teaches stromal laser photodisruption, & Shimmick et al. (US 6,497,701 B2) teaches a deflection unit.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RONALD HUNTER whose telephone number is (571)270-7133. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Johnson can be reached on (571) 272-4768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/565,723 Page 9

Art Unit: 3769

Examiner, Art Unit 3769